55003 Decision No.

GH

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation upon the Commission's own motion to ascertain the present and potential demands for and availability for facilities for telephone service, and the need for and propriety of emergency modification of current rules or practices to facilitate the furhishing of telephone service.

Case No. 5337

Bacigalupi, Elkus & Salinger by <u>Claude N.</u> <u>Rosenberg</u> for California Water & Telephone Company; <u>Albert M. Hart</u> for General Telephone Company of Colifornia, petitioners. <u>Bert Buzzini</u> for California Farm Bureau Federation; interested party. James F. Haley for the Commission Staff.

FIFTH INTERIM OPINION ON PETITIONS TO RETAIN MORE DEFAILED PRIORITY RULE.

Reason for Decision

The third interim opinion and order in the above-entitled investigation provided a "short form" of priority rule for the utilities to file; however, for those utilities which will require the retention of the "more detailed priority rule" in any exchange after July 1, 1957, it required such utilities to file formal petitions by March 1, 1957, and thereafter not later than September 1 of each year, commencing with the year 1958, containing a list of exchanges where the more detailed rule will be required in the ensuing year together with certain supporting data. Accordingly, petitions were filed by the Western California Telephone Company, the California Water & Telephone Company and the General Telephone Company of California. The petition of the Western California Telephone Company was denied by the Fourth Interim Opinion and Order herein. The other

Decision No. 54822, dated April 9, 1957.

two petitions were set for public hearing to obtain completion of information as to the need for such more detailed priority rules. <u>Public Hearing</u>

After due notice, public hearing on those two petitions was held before Examiner Manley W. Edwards on April 2, 1957, in Los Angeles. Petitioners presented six exhibits and testimony by four witnesses in support of their request. The Commission staff, represented by a telephone engineer, cross-examined the witnesses for the purpose of developing a full record to aid the Commission in deciding this matter.

Position of California Water & Telephone Company

The California Water & Telephone Company stated that during the past few years there has been tremendous growth and development in most of its exchanges and it has not been possible, up to this time, for it to finance and construct the additional telephone plant required in order to furnish service on a current basis in all of its exchanges. In most exchanges it expects to be current by December 31, 1957. The following tabulation shows the number of lines currently installed, the estimated requirement and the estimated lines as of

-2-

- C-5337 GH

Exchange		HER OF LINES	·	Held
and Central	:Installed : as of	: <u>Estimate</u> :Requirement	ed: :Lines as :	Orders as of
<u>Office</u>	:_3/1/57	:12/31/57	: <u>of 12/31/57</u> :	1/31/57
San Fernando				
Main	9,850	6,500	9,850)	
Granada Pacoima	3,200	4,500	5,100)	
Sepulveda	8,700	7,500 7,200	8,060 .) 10,100)	566
Sylmar		3,800	4,570	
Monrovia	8,700	11,700	11,500	-
Sierra Madre	5,660	5,000	5,660	-
Redlands				
Main	3,920	4,400	4,520 >	
Loma Linda	600	730	(008	111
Mentone Yucaipa	400	395	500)	
-	1,000	1,100	1,625)	
Banning	1,000	· 1,410	1,600)	
Beaumont	823	729	1826 j	208
Palm Springs				
Main	4,200	4,258	5,600)	
Cathedral City	800	4,258 1,416	1,480)	289
Desert Hot Springs	300	5+9	600	. 45
Joshua Tree				
Main	100	164	200)	
Yucca	80	177	180 j	107
Twentynine Palms				
Main	600	1,000 187	800)	,
Marine Palms	150	187	250 5	139
Moreno	600	715	, 760	277
Perris	600	600	600	91
Hemet				
Main	1,200	1,346	1,600)	
San Jacinto	500	479	600)	186
Idyllwild	240	241	400	36
Elsinore				
Main	600	600	700)	1
Grand	90	200	90)	43
Murietta	75	92	75	· 24
Temecula	30	35	.30	6
	-			U

December 31, 1957, and the current held orders for main stations:

-3-

Ĩ

- C-5337 GH

Of the above-listed exchanges the California Company indicates that it needs the more detailed priority rule in all exchanges except Monrovia and Sierra Madre.

Position of General Telephone Company of California

The General Company requests that it be permitted to retain the more detailed priority rule in all of its exchanges because it has many exchanges in which telephone service is not now or will not be on a current basis due to the unprecedented population growth in certain areas, and with regard to the exchanges that are now on a current basis, it has no assurance that it will be able to provide service on a current basis in such exchanges continuously to September, 1958, and thereafter. In Exhibit A attached to its petition, it listed dates by certain of its exchanges when it will be able to furnish interim relief and permanent relief on a current basis. Such exhibit was withdrawn and replaced at the hearing by Exhibit No. P-6. This exhibit shows the exchanges and central offices where telephone service is not now furnished on a current basis, but which may cease to be current prior to September 1, 1958, as follows:

Exchange and Central Office	Estimated to be on a Current <u>Basis</u>	Number Held Orders Prior to Final <u>Relief</u>	First Block- out Date
Pomona San Dimas	Mar. 1957	30	Feb. 1957
San Bernardino	Apr. 1957	531	Oct. 1956
Thousand Oaks	Jun. 1957	129	Nov. 1956
Westminster	Jul. 1957	559	Apr. 1957
Long Beach Termino	Oct. 1957	1,348	May 1957
Santa Barbara	Aug. 1957	340	May 1957

__+_

- C-5337 GH

ŝ

Exchange and Central Office	Estimated to be on a Current Easis	Number Held Orders Prior to Final <u>Relief</u>	First Block- out Date
Pomona Claremont	Mar. 1958	719	Nov. 1956
Reedley	Mar. 1958	63	Dec. 1957
Santa Monica	Mar. 1958	1,110	Apr. 1957
Pomona	May, 1958	1,623	Nov. 1956
Malibu	May, 1958	36	May, 1956
Downey Norwalk	May, 1958	492	Dec. 1957
Redondo	Jul. 1958	2,106	May, 1957
Whittier South	Aug. 1958	568	Feb. 1958
Covina Glendora	Aug. 1958	1,343	Jan. 1958
Ontario Upland	Aug. 1958	608	Nov. 1957
Pomona Chino	Aug. 1958	75	Jul. 1958
Downey Bellflower	Sept. 1958	1,812	Mar. 1957
Santa Maria Orcutt	Sept. 1958	23	Apr. 1958
Downey	Oct. 1958	430	Jun. 1958
Covina Azusa	Oct. 1958	707	Jun. 1957
Covina Baldwin Park	Oct. 1958	257	Aug. 1958
Oxnard	Oct. 1958	1,417	Oct. 1957
Lindsay Strathmore	Oct. 1958	37	Jan. 1958
Laguna Beach	Oct. 1958	223	Sept. 1957
Redondo Palos Verdes	Oct. 1958	211	Jun. 1956
Covina	Nov. 1958	3,112	Dec. 1957

-5-

С-5337 СН

Exchange and Central Office	Estimated to be on a Current Basis	Number Held Orders Prior to Final <u>Relief</u>	First Block- out Date
Huntington Beach	Nov. 1958	411	Jan. 1958
Whittier La Habra	Dec. 1958	1,077	Nov. 1956
Whittier Pico	Dec. 1958	723	June 1958
Etiwanda	Dec. 1958	368	Mar. 1958
San Bernardino Marshall	Dec. 1958	1,689	Sept. 1957
Santa Earbara Goleta	Jan. 1959	265	Jul. 1958
Santa Maria	Jan. 1959	727	May 1958
Downey Artesia	Feb. 1959	1,000	Jul. 1957
Santa Barbara Montecito	Feb. 1959	207	Nov. 1957
Carpinteria	Mar. 1959	219	Jul. 1957
Lancaster	Mar. 1959	2,656	Apr. 1957
Santa Monica Mar Vista	Apr. 1959	840	Jun. 1958
Ontario	May, 1959	2,465	Apr. 1957

In proposing that the more detailed rule be kept on a company-wide basis the General Company stated that the problem of internal administration would be simplified.

Stated Disadvantages of Short Form of Rule

These two petitioners stated that there are disadvantages to the short form of rule. One principal disadvantage is that the new rule requires clerks to make decisions that are made for them in the more detailed rule. For example, under the more detailed rule a doctor's certificate is required to establish a condition of serious

-6-

с-5337 сн *

illness, whereas there is no such requirement under the new rule. Petitioners represent that where service cannot be given for a considerable time in the future, it saves the clerks a lot of argument with prospective customers if they can be shown in the rule just where they fit. Under the new rule the utility would have to adopt standards and administrative procedures to assist the clerks in administrative handling of the new rule.

One witness expressed the view that there would be less complaint from prospective customers under the more detailed rule and therefore stated the belief that it would be more in the public interest.

The General Company stated it is doing everything reasonably possible to avert held orders and that it does not desire to use this rule as an excuse for the position in which it finds itself. The main difficulty is that the growth in some places exceeds what appears to be a reasonable estimate.

6

The General Company addressed a letter to the Commission, under date of February 28, 1957, requesting authority to depart, until October 31, 1957, from its priority rule in the Palos Verdes central office area of the Redondo exchange to the extent of not reclassifying held applications for service to Category I six months after receipt. In a letter, dated March 11, 1957, the Commission advised the General Company that its request would be considered in connection with this proceeding. General's Palos Verdes central office is blocked out at present, and the receipt of high priority applications, plus the reclassification of held residence applications to Category I, are precluding the establishment of telephone service to business applicants. Because it appears that the special circumstances causing this situation were beyond the company's control,

-7-

the order will grant General's request.

Findings and Conclusions

The request by the California Water & Telephone Company was in accord with the procedure set forth in our third interim order and we find that it should be granted. The request by the General Telephone Company of California went beyond the limits contemplated in our third interim order in that it requested permission to retain the more detailed rule in exchanges where telephone service is on a current basis as well as those where service is not on such a basis.

Our original order contemplated having the more detailed rule in those exchanges where shortages are being experienced, but not in those exchanges on a current service basis. We are still of the opinion that the short form rule will suffice in the future for those exchanges now current and find no reason to change our previous position in this matter. The request of the General Company to maintain the rule in all exchanges will not be granted.

FIFTH INTERIM ORDER

Petitions having been entered by the California Water & Telephone Company and the General Telephone Company of California regarding retention of a more detailed telephone service priority rule in certain or all exchanges, public hearing having been held and the Commission now being fully advised; therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORD JRED that:

1. The California Water & Telephone Company may retain the more detailed priority rule in effect until September 1, 1958, in only

C-5337 GH

the following exchanges:

Banning - Beaumont Desert Hot Springs	Palm Springs
Elsinore	Perris
Hemet	Redlands San Fernando
Idyllwild	San Jacinto
Joshua Tree	Temecula
Moreno Murrieta	Twentynine Palms

2. The General Telephone Company of California may retain the more detailed priority rule in effect until September 1, 1958, in only the following exchanges:

> Carpinteria Covina Downey Etiwanda Huntington Beach Laguna Beach Lancaster Lindsay Long Beach Malibu Ontario

Oxnard Pomona Redondo Reedley San Bernardino Santa Barbara Santa Maria Santa Monica Thousand Oaks Westminster Whittier

3. The General Telephone Company of California is authorized to depart from its Rule 8 in the Palos Verdes central office area of its Redondo exchange only to the extent of not reclassifying held applications for service to Category I six months after they are received. This authorization will terminate on October 31, 1957.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

San Francisco Dated at California, this 8 4 day of CIA 1957. dent Commissioners